

REMARKS

The undersigned wishes to thank Examiner Davis for her courtesies extended during the telephone interview of December 3, 2004. During that interview, the undersigned agreed to amend independent claim 1 by adding further specific details about indicia sections thereto, and to amend independent claim 12 by adding method steps to show a preprinted card which is then autographed. It is believed that by adding these limitations, claims 1-7 and 9-16 are patentable and in condition for allowance.

Applicant's invention is directed to finding lost individuals. Applicant recognizes that the prior art printing of missing persons on postcards or cartons of milk is ineffective. The target audience for these devices, as well as television, keeps the image of the missing person in a third party's memory for only a short period of time, making these prior art devices ineffective.

Applicant realized that if a card, for example, is created with the missing person's vital statistics and additional indicia, such as a baseball player with the players autograph, the card will have an added value and the third party will keep the card in close proximity and continually look at it, increasing the visibility of the missing person. Further, the prior art devices generally do not address children in attempts to aid in locating missing people. The present invention targets children, in that, as a group, children will value an autograph of a sports player or other famous person and continually look at the card. This will continually place the image of the missing person on the child's mind and aid in locating the missing person.

Claims 1-7 and 9-16 are currently pending in this application. Claims 1 and 12 have been amended. Support for all amendments may be found in the specification and drawings as originally filed. No new matter has been added.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claims 1-7, and 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), as being anticipated by \$100,000 Reward: Missing Downtown Eastside Women Poster (hereinafter "Reward Poster"). Claim 1 was amended to positively claim areas on a first section of the card for indicia of the missing person and a second section of the card for the individual's autograph and an individual's photograph. Furthermore, the claim was amended to show that specific indicia for finding the missing person, such as a date that the person went missing, a contact in case the person was found and a name of the missing person are all presented on the first section of the body underneath the photograph of the missing person. It is believed that the separation of the first section from the second section, along with further separating areas within those sections, further distinguishes the present invention over the Reward Poster. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the Examiner's rejection of claims 1-7, 11.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-7, 9 and 11-16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) for obviousness over U.S. Patent No. 2,395,804 to De Gruchy (hereinafter "De Gruchy"). Claim 10 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) for obviousness over De Gruchy in view of U.S.

Patent No. 5,983,537 to Johnson. Claims 12-16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) for obviousness over "\$100,000 Reward: Missing Downtown Eastside Women Poster."

Independent claim 12 has been amended to show an unobvious functional relationship between the card and the secondary autograph and photograph of an individual. Since the reward poster does not teach the step of providing an autograph portion containing a signature and photograph of an individual different than the missing person, however the Examiner believes this to be obvious, we have amended to further distinguish from the Reward Poster by claiming a preprinted card with an autograph area. Prior to providing the preprinted card with an area for an autograph, the card is autographed on the body in the area provided for autograph by the person whose photograph is provided. In the case of the Reward Poster, all of the information is preprinted. There would be no reason to ever have the Reward Poster autographed at a later time, it would certainly not be an obvious reason. In addition, the autograph provides an intrinsic value to the card, whereby the possessor of the card, in many cases children, will be enticed to keep the card as a memento of the game and display the card to friends. Therefore the autograph portion provides an entirely different and unobvious functional relationship than the Reward Poster.

In view of the forgoing, claims 1 and 12 are patentable over the prior art of record. Dependent claims 2-6, 9-11 and 13-16 are patentable for at least the same reasons claims 1 and/or 12 are patentable.


Application No. 10/081,434
Paper Dated: December 27, 2004
In Reply to USPTO Correspondence of September 27, 2004
Attorney Docket No. 3853-011292

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration of the Examiner's rejections and allowance of pending claims 1-7 and 9-16 are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

WEBB ZIESENHEIM LOGSDON
ORKIN & HANSON, P.C.

By 
Paul M. Reznick
Registration No. 33,059
Attorney for Applicant
700 Koppers Building
436 Seventh Avenue
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15219-1818
Telephone: 412-471-8815
Facsimile: 412-471-4094
E-mail: webblaw@webblaw.com